

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1, 11 and 20, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support to the amendments is provided throughout the Specification, specifically on pages 31 and 37.

No new matter has been introduced. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

### **II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101 and §103(a)**

Claims 20-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11-14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,642,153 to Chaney, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Chaney”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,002,394 to Schein, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Schein”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,850,218 to LaJoie, et al. (hereinafter, merely “LaJoie”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,528,670 to Elliot, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Elliot”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,793,410 to Rao (hereinafter, merely “Rao”) and U.S. Patent No.

6,510,556 to Kusaba, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Kusaba”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,876 to DeFreese, et al. (hereinafter, merely “DeFreese”).

Claims 5, 8, 15, 18, 24 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chaney in view of Schein, LaJoie, Elliot, Rao, Kusaba, DeFreese, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,226 to Sorensen, (hereinafter, merely “Sorensen”).

Claims 9 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chaney in view of Schein, LaJoie, Elliot, Rao, Kusaba, DeFreese and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,075,570 to Usui, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Usui”).

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chaney in view of Schein, LaJoie, Elliot, Rao, Kusaba, DeFreese and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,497 to Ellis, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Ellis”).

Claims 10, 19 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chaney in view of Schein, LaJoie, Elliot, Rao, Kusaba, DeFreese and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,563,648 to Menand, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Menand”).

### III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

#### A. Response to Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 20 is amended, thereby obviating the rejections.

#### B. Response to Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“A television receiver, comprising...

**...wherein when a channel associated with one or more accessed web pages is selected, the most recently viewed portion of the associated one or more accessed web pages is**

**displayed in an off-line mode first and then is updated according to a user's operation.**" (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Chaney, Schein, LaJoie, Elliot, Rao, Kusaba, DeFreese, Sorensen, Usui, and Menand, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, nothing in the references teaches or discloses "wherein when a channel associated with one or more accessed web pages is selected, the most recently viewed portion of the associated one or more accessed web pages is displayed in an off-line mode first and then is updated according to a user's operation", as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Indeed, claim 1 recites displaying web pages of the receiver upon switching channels. None of the references relied by the Office Action teaches or discloses the above-identified features of claim 1.

Applicants submit that the combination of references, while nothing more than a mosaic of features combined using hindsight, fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 11 and 20 are also patentable.

#### **IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.


#### **CONCLUSION**

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By 

Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800